

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: OOMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS O Hox 1450 According, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usrlo.gov

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. FILING DATE APPLICATION NO. FUJZ 19.484 1978 10/087,095 03/01/2002 Hideaki Ono **EXAMINER** 26304 7590 01/31/2006 KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP SALAD, ABDULLAHI ELMI **575 MADISON AVENUE** PAPER NUMBER **ART UNIT** NEW YORK, NY 10022-2585 2157

DATE MAILED: 01/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/087,095	ONO ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Salad E. Abdullahi	2157

	Examine	Ait oiiit			
	Salad E. Abdullahi	2157			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 29 December 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.					
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
NOTICE OF APPEAL					
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).					
AMENDMENTS	hut make the plate of filling a balet	will not be entered by			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,			ecause		
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):					
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the					
non-allowable claim(s).					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-16</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	at before or on the date of filing a Nord d sufficient reasons why the affidate	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence is	t be entered s necessary and		
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER					
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached.					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
13.					

Application/Control Number: 10/087,095 Page 2

Art Unit: 2157

A) Applicant alleges "it appears the rejection was changed without claim amendment" because on current final office action the examiner pointed another paragraph/section of the reference which is different than the paragraph/section pointed on the previous office action and the finality of the office action should be withdrawn.

Examiner respectfully disagrees, because grounds of rejection can only be changed be when a new references is introduced by the examiner. In this case no new reference(s) was used by the examiner.

B) Applicant alleges Rajahalme fails to disclose "means for a destination server to be connected based on the identification information".

Examiner respectfully disagrees because Rajahalme discloses detecting the arrival of an IP packet, examining the packet and routing means that route the packet then to a correspondent destination node based mobile IP binding information contained on the packet (see paragraph 0041 and 0047).

